arXiv:1609.05372v2 [stat.CO] 25 Jan 2017

Permutation and Grouping Methods for Sharpening Gaussian Process Approximations

Joseph Guinness

North Carolina State University, Department of Statistics

Abstract

Vecchia's approximate likelihood for Gaussian process parameters depends on how the observations are ordered, which can be viewed as a deficiency because the exact likelihood is permutation-invariant. This article takes the alternative standpoint that the ordering of the observations can be tuned to sharpen the approximations. Advantageously chosen orderings can drastically improve the approximations, and in fact, completely random orderings often produce far more accurate approximations than default coordinate-based orderings do. In addition to the permutation results, automatic methods for grouping calculations of components of the approximation are introduced, having the result of simultaneously improving the quality of the approximation and reducing its computational burden. In common settings, reordering combined with grouping reduces Kullback-Leibler divergence from the target model by a factor of 80 and computation time by a factor of 2 compared to ungrouped approximations with default ordering. The claims are supported by theory and numerical results with comparisons to other approximations, including tapered covariances and stochastic partial differential equation approximations. Computational details are provided, including efficiently finding the orderings and ordered nearest neighbors, and profiling out linear mean parameters and using the approximations for prediction and conditional simulation. An application to space-time satellite data is presented.

1 Introduction

Soon after likelihood-based methods for estimating spatial covariance parameters were popularized by the work of Mardia and Marshall (1984), Vecchia (1988) introduced an approximation designed to reduce the computational burden of evaluating the likelihood. Suppose that the n observation locations are labeled 1 through n, as in $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define $y_i := y(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ to be the observation associated with location x_i and the vector $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$. In a Gaussian process, the data y are modeled as $Y \sim N(\mu, \Sigma_\theta)$, where Σ_θ is a covariance matrix with (i, j) entry determined by covariance function $K_\theta(x_i, x_j)$ depending on a vector of covariance parameters θ. Let $\tau : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be a permutation of the integers 1 through n, and define the permuted vector y^τ, where $y_i^\tau = y_{\tau(i)}$. For any permutation τ, the joint density for the observations can be written as a product of conditional densities

$$p_\theta(y_1, \ldots, y_n) = p_\theta(y_1^\tau) \prod_{i=2}^{n} p_\theta(y_i^\tau | y_1^\tau, \ldots, y_{i-1}^\tau),$$

reflecting the invariance of the joint density to arbitrary relabeling of the observations. Vecchia's approximation replaces the complete conditioning vectors $(y_1^\tau, \ldots, y_{i-1}^\tau)$, with a subvector. Specifically, let $\{j_{i1}, \ldots, j_{im_i}\}$ be a set of integers between 1 and $i-1$, and define the approximation

$$p_{\theta,\tau,J}(y_1, \ldots, y_n) = p_\theta(y_1^\tau) \prod_{i=2}^{n} p_\theta(y_i^\tau | y_{j_{i1}}^\tau, \ldots, y_{j_{im_i}}^\tau), \tag{1}$$

where $J = \{J_1, \ldots, J_n\}$ is collection of sets $J_i := \{j_{i1}, \ldots, j_{im_i}, i\}$, which I refer to as the neighbors of observation i (by convention every observation neighbors itself). Since Vecchia's approximation is defined as an ordered sequence of valid conditional distributions, $p_{\theta,\tau,J}$ forms a valid joint distribution. Also, its definition as a product of conditional distributions allows the approximation to be easily parallelized.

Clearly, the quality of the approximation depends on the choice of J since the approximate likelihood differs from the exact likelihood if any $m_i \neq i-1$. The quality of the approximation also depends on τ, a fact acknowledged in the literature, but not yet carefully explored until now. Banerjee et al. (2014) outline some of the common criticisms of Vecchia's approximation,

> "However, the approach suffers many problems. First, it is not formally defined. Second, it will typically be sequence dependent, though there is no natural ordering of the spatial locations. Most troubling is the arbitrariness in the number of and choice of 'neighbors.' Moreover, perhaps counter-intuitively, we can not merely select locations close to $\boldsymbol{s}_i$ (as we would have with the full data likelihood) in order to learn about the spatial decay in dependence for the process. So, altogether, we do not see such approximations as useful approach."

I take the stance that viewing order dependence as an aspect of the approximation that can be tuned–rather than as an inherent deficiency–is a fruitful avenue for improving the approximation. Datta et al. (2015) conducted a simulation study to compare three coordinate-based orderings and concluded that the inferences are "extremely robust to the ordering of the locations." On the contrary, I find, quite suprisingly, that default orderings based on sorting the locations on a coordinate are often badly suboptimal compared to even a completely random ordering of the points. Moreover, I show that the more carefully constructed maximum minimum distance ordering is a further improvement and can achieve greater than 99% relative efficiency for estimating covariance parameters with as few as 30 neighbors, chosen to be simply the 30 nearest previous points. These results address most of the concerns raised by Banerjee et al. (2014): Order dependence can be exploited to improve the approximation. For maximum minimum distance ordering, a simple choice of nearest neighbors is effective for this ordering. I prove that the quality of the model approximation is nondecreasing as the number of neighbors increases, so that the choice of the number of neighbors is governed by a natural tradeoff between computational efficiency and model approximation.

In addition to the results on orderings, I describe how the approximation can be computed more efficiently, both in terms of memory burden and floating point operations, by grouping the observations into blocks and evaluating each group's contribution to the likelihood simultaneously. The grouped version of the approximation is particularly interesting because not only does it reduce the computational burden, but I prove that it is guaranteed to improve the model approximation. I also describe and implement a computationally efficient algorithm for grouping the observations and numerical studies supporting the theoretical results.

The consideration of arbitrary orderings presents some computatational issues that are not problematic for coordinate-based orderings. First, obviously, is the issue of how to find the orderings. The maximum minimum distance ordering requires $O(n^3)$ floating point operations. However, I introduce an $O(n \log n)$ algorithm for finding an ordering that mimics the salient

features of the maximum minimum distance ordering. Second, a naive search for ordered nearest neighbors requires $O(n^2 \log n)$ flops. I adapt a well-known method for finding nearest neighbors to the case when the neighbors must come from earlier in the ordering. I also describe methods for profiling out linear mean parameters and using the approximation for spatial prediction and for efficiently drawing from the conditional distribution at a set of unobserved locations given the data, which is a useful way to quantify joint uncertainty in predicted values.

Several articles have investigated properties and extensions of Vecchia's approximation. Pardo-Igúzquiza and Dowd (1997) describe Fortran 77 software for computing the approximate likelihood and compare a random ordering versus a sorted coordinate ordering on a small dataset of size 41. Stein et al. (2004) describe how Vecchia's approximation can be extended to residual/restricted maximum likelihood estimation, how a different form of blocking can be used to speed the computations, and how conditioning on nearest neighbors can be suboptimal when points are ordered according to the coordinates. Sun and Stein (2014) use Vecchia's approximation to define several unbiased estimating equations for estimating covariance parameters. Datta et al. (2015) use Vecchia's approximation as part of a hierarchical Bayesian specification of spatial processes, and Datta et al. (2016) discuss interpretation of the approximation as an approximation to the inverse Cholesky factor of the covariance matrix and apply it to multivariate spatial data. Vecchia's approximation has been used in various applications, including for seismic data (Eide et al., 2002) and space-time SPDE models (Jones and Zhang, 1997).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines formal definitions for the orderings. Section 3 presents the computational and theoretical results related to grouping the observations, establishing that grouping observations simultaneously reduces computational effort and improves the model approximations. Section 4 addreses additional computational issues described above. Section 5 contains numerical and timing experiments studying the relative efficiencies for various orderings, Kullback-Leibler divergence for various orderings and for other proposed Gaussian process approximations, and timing results. Section 6 includes an application of the methods to space-time satellite data, and I conclude with a discussion in Section 7.

2 Permutation Designs

In the numerical analysis literature on sparse matrix factorizations, it is widely recognized that row-column reordering schemes for large sparse symmetric positive definite matrices are essential for increasing the sparsity of the Cholesky factor (Saad, 2003). Finding an optimal such ordering is an NP-complete problem (Yannakakis, 1981), and so the algorithms in use are necessarily heuristic, but heuristic algorithms, such as the approximate minimum degree algorithm (Amestoy et al., 1996), have proven to be effective. The goals in Gaussian process approximation are related in that we search for an ordering that produces an approximately sparse inverse Cholesky factor. However, the problem at hand here is more difficult and perhaps less well-defined than sparse matrix factorization; our task is to find the best reordering of observations that produces accurate approximations to the joint density or an approximate likelihood function that delivers efficient parameter estimates, a criterion that depends on the derivative of the approximate and exact likelihood functions with respect to the covariance parameters. Thus, it is unlikely that we will be able to find "optimal" orderings for large datasets. Nevertheless, as in the sparse matrix case, we show in this paper that heuristically motivated orderings can offer significant improvements in statistical efficiency and model approximation over default orderings.

It appears that the default choice is to order the points by sorting on one of the coordinates.



Figure 1: Examples of four orderings of 400 locations on a 20×20 grid. From left to right are completely random, maximum minimum distance, middle out, and sorted on vertical coordinate. On the top row, the black circles are ordered 1-50, circled point is number 50, and squared points are 30 nearest neighbors to point 50 among previous points. Bottom row is the same for point ordered number 330.

This is the ordering used in Vecchia (1988), Sun and Stein (2014), and Datta et al. (2015). Stein et al. (2004) use an ordering based on sorting the points on the sum of their coordinates, which is equivalent to ordering on one of the coordinates in a system rotated by $\pi/4$. I refer to such orderings as *sorted coordinate* orderings.

The numerical studies in Section 5 indicate that the following ordering scheme is effective for Matérn covariance models. This ordering selects a point in the center first–the center being the mean location or some other measure of centrality, generically denoted as $\overline{x}$–then sequentially picks the next point to have maximum minimum distance to all previously selected points, that is

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(1) &= \underset{i \in 1,\ldots,n}{\arg\min} \|x_i - \overline{x}\|, \\ \tau(j) &= \underset{i \notin \tau(1),\ldots,\tau(j-1)}{\arg\max} \; \min_{k \in 1,\ldots,j-1} \|x_i - x_{\tau(k)}\|, \quad j > 1.\end{aligned}$$

The result is that the first k points form a space-covering set, none of which are too near each other. I refer to this ordering as a *maximum minimum distance* (MMD) ordering, and any approximation to it as an approximate MMD (AMMD) ordering. The numerical studies also indicate that it is sometimes beneficial to sort the points by their distance to some point in the domain. For example, the points can be sorted based on their distance to $\overline{x}$. I use *middle out* ordering to refer to sorting based on distance to the center. I define a *completely random* ordering to be a draw from the uniform distribution on all permutations. Examples of the four orderings are give in Figure 1.

3 Grouping Observations

Let $B = \{B_1, \ldots, B_K\}$ be a partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, and define $U_k = \bigcup_{b \in B_k} J_b$, the union of all neighbors of observations with indices in B_k. Suppose that $i \in B_k$, and define $\overline{J}_i$ as follows:

$$\overline{J}_i = \{j \in U_k : j \leq i\},$$



Figure 2: Example with $B_1 = \{45, 60\}$. (a) Point 45 (circled), points 1 through 45 (black or red), J_{45} (red). (b) Point 60 (circled), points 1 through 60 (black or blue), J_{60} (blue). (c) Points 1 through 60 (not gray), $\overline{J}_{45}$ (purple), $\overline{J}_{60}$ (purple + blue). $\overline{J}_{45}$ has three more points than J_{45}, and $\overline{J}_{60}$ has 7 more points than J_{60}.

so that $\overline{J}_i$ is the union of all neighbors of the observations with index in B_k, subject to the requirement that all elements of $\overline{J}_i$ must be less than or equal to i. Thus $\overline{J}_i$ is a set of integers between 1 and i that includes i. Therefore $\overline{J}_i$ conforms to our convention and $p_{\theta,\tau,\overline{J}}$ is an approximation in the form of (1). I refer to $p_{\theta,\tau,\overline{J}}$ as the grouped version of the ungrouped approximation $p_{\theta,\tau,J}$. Figure 2 gives an example of how $\overline{J}_i$ is constructed for a group containing two points.

In this Section, I prove that the grouped approximation is no worse than its ungrouped counterpart (and could be better) in terms of Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence. Moreover, I outline how an entire group's contribution to the likelihood can be computed simultaneously, and I demonstrate that if the partition B is chosen well, the simultaneous computation is lighter, both in terms of floating point operations and memory, which is important for implementation on shared memory parallel systems. Essentially, grouping gives us better approximations for free.

Stein et al. (2004) considered a blockwise version of Vecchia's likelihood and demonstrated that blocking can reduce the computational burden. The grouping methods developed here differ in that they operate on the ordering and neighbor sets after they have been defined. This gives us the freedom to first choose an advantangeous ordering and neighbor sets, and then use grouping to reduce the computational effort and improve the model accuracy. The grouping scheme here is also more general in that observations within a group are not required to be ordered continguously, nor are observations within one group required to condition on all observations in another group. Stein et al. (2004) also did not consider the effect of blocking on the model approximation.

3.1 Improved Model Approximations

To gain an intuition for why grouping observations improves the accuracy of the model approximation, I briefly review one interpretation of the inverse Cholesky factor of a covariance matrix (Pourahmadi, 1999). Suppose $Y = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)^T$ is a mean-zero multivariate normal vector with $E(YY^T) = \Sigma$, which has Cholesky decomposition $\Sigma = LL^T$. Let L^{ij} be the (i, j) entry of L^{-1}. The transformation $Z = L^{-1}Y$ is decorrelating and can be interpreted as follows;

for any $i = 2, \ldots, n$,

$$Z_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} L^{ij} Y_j = L^{ii}\left[Y_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\left(\frac{-L^{ij}}{L^{ii}}\right) Y_j\right],$$

is the standardized residual of the projection of Y_i onto $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_{i-1})$, L^{ii} is the reciprocal of the residual standard deviation, and $-L^{ij}/L^{ii}$ are the coefficients of the projection. The coefficients can also be interpreted as those defining the best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP) of Y_i using $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_{i-1})$, an interpretation which can be extended to the case of a linear mean function (Stein et al., 2004). Defining $z = L^{-1}y$, the conditional density for Y_i given $Y_1, \ldots, Y_{i-1}$ can be written as

$$\log p_\theta(y_i | y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}) = -\frac{1}{2}\log 2\pi + \log L^{ii} - \frac{1}{2} z_i^2,$$

and thus the ith row of L^{-1} encodes the conditional density for Y_i given $Y_1, \ldots, Y_{i-1}$.

Vecchia's approximation replaces L^{-1} with a sparse approximation $\widetilde{L}^{-1}$, since Y_i is projected onto a subset of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_{i-1})$, and thus $\widetilde{L}^{ij}$ is zero if Y_j is not in the conditioning set for Y_i. Because of the BLUP interpretation, $\widetilde{L}^{ii} \leq L^{ii}$ for every i. Taking this a step further, suppose $\widetilde{L}_1^{-1}$ and $\widetilde{L}_2^{-1}$ represent two approximations that use the same ordering with with different conditioning sets given by J^1 and J^2. If J_i^1 is contained in J_i^2 for every i, then $\widetilde{L}_1^{ii} \leq \widetilde{L}_2^{ii}$, because the variance of the BLUP cannot increase when additional variables are added to the conditioning set.

The Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence from p_1 to p_0 is defined as $KL(p_0||p_1) = E(\log(p_0/p_1))$, where the expectation is with respect to p_0. The following theorem establishes that the KL divergence is nonincreasing as observations are added to the conditioning sets. This result is needed to show that the grouped approximation is no worse than its ungrouped counterpart (and could be better).

Theorem 1. *If $J_i^1 \subset J_i^2$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then $KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,J^2}) \leq KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,J^1})$.*

Proof. Let Σ_1 and Σ_2 be the covariance matrices under p_{θ,τ,J^1} and p_{θ,τ,J^2}. The difference between the KL-divergences is given by

$$KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,J^1}) - KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,J^2}) = \frac{1}{2}\left(E(Y^T\Sigma_1^{-1}Y) - E(Y^T\Sigma_2^{-1}Y) - \log\det\Sigma_1^{-1} + \log\det\Sigma_2^{-1}\right).$$

Writing $\Sigma_k^{-1} = L_k^{-T}L_k^{-1}$, where L_k^{-1} is the approximate inverse Cholesky factor determined by Vecchia's approximation, it is easy to see that the entries of $Z_k = L_k^{-1}Y$ have mean zero and variance 1, and so $E(Z_k^T Z_k) = n$, and the quadratic form terms are equal.

The determinant of Σ_k^{-1} can be computed by taking the square of the product of the entries of L_k^{-1}. Since $J_i^1 \subset J_i^2$ for every i, we have that $0 \leq L_1^{ii} \leq L_2^{ii}$ for every i, so $\log\det\Sigma_1^{-1} \leq \log\det\Sigma_2^{-1}$, and thus $KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,J^2}) \leq KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,J^1})$, as desired. □

Corallary 1 follows from Theorem 1 when we note that, by definition, $\overline{J}_i$ contains J_i, since $i \in B_k$ and all elements of J_i are less than or equal to i.

Corollary 1. *The grouped approximation has smaller KL divergence than its ungrouped counterpart, i.e.*

$$KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,\overline{J}}) \leq KL(p_\theta||p_{\theta,\tau,J})$$

3.2 Simultaneous Computation

Let Σ_k be the covariance matrix for observations with indices in U_k, with observations ordered increasing in their indices. If we define L_k to be the Cholesky factor of Σ_k, each row of L_k^{-1} encodes the conditional distribution of an observation with index in U_k given those ordered before in U_k. Since $\overline{J}_i$ contains precisely those indices ordered before i in U_k, we can calculate the contribution of observations with indices $i \in B_k$ to $p_{\theta,\tau,\overline{J}}$ simultaneously, by forming and factoring a single covariance matrix Σ_k. If a group of observations share a substantial number of neighbors, computational savings, both in time and memory, can be gained by computing each group's contribution to the likelihood in this simultaneous way.

To illustrate this point, consider the canonical ordering and two observations y_i and y_{i+2} with $J_i = (i-m, \ldots, i)$ and $J_{i+2} = (i-m+2, \ldots, i+2)$, so that each observation conditions on the m previous ones. The computational cost of factoring the covariance matrices for the observations and their respective neighbors is $1/3(m+1)^3$ floating point operatations each, for a total of $2/3(m+1)^3$ operations, and $(m+1)^2$ memory units each, for a total of $2(m+1)^2$ memory units. Now, suppose that $B_1 = \{i, i+2\}$, and thus $U_1 = \{i-m, \ldots, i+2\}$, $\overline{J}_i = J_i$, $\overline{J}_{i+2} = \{i-m, \ldots, i+2\}$, and Σ_1 is the $(m+3)\times(m+3)$ covariance matrix for $(y_{i-m}, \ldots, y_{i+2})$. Row $m+1$ of L_1^{-1} encodes the conditional distribution of y_i given $(y_{i-m}, \ldots, y_{i-1})$, and row $m+3$ of L_1^{-1} encodes the conditional distribution of y_{i+1} given $(y_{i-m}, \ldots, y_{i+1})$, which is what is required for calculating the contribution from y_i and y_{i+2} to the grouped likelihood approximation. The computational cost of forming and factoring Σ_1 is $(m+3)^2$ memory units and $1/3(m+3)^3$ flops, so in addition to the increased accuracy of the approximation (Corollary 1), we also achieve computational savings in flops if $m > 6$ and in memory if $m > 3$.

3.3 Grouping Algorithm

Since the groupings are a partition of the set of observations, it is of interest to find good partitions that improve the model and lessen computational cost. Here, I describe a fast greedy algorithm that depends only on the ordering and the neighbor sets. The algorithm starts with $B_k = \{k\}$, each index in its own block and proceeds to propose joining pairs of blocks.

Grouping algorithm:

Set $B = \{\{1\}, \ldots, \{n\}\}$
for $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$ **do**
  for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ **do**
    Pick k so that $i \in B_k$
    Pick k' so that $j_{i\ell} \in B_{k'}$
    if $(\#(U_k \cup U_{k'}))^2 \leq (\#U_k)^2 + (\#U_{k'})^2$ **then**
      Set $B_k = B_k \cup B_{k'}$
      Set $B_{k'} = \{\}$
    end if
  end for
end for

The joining of two blocks is accepted if the square of the number of neighbors of the joined block is less then the sum of the squares of the number of neighbors in the two blocks. This ensures that the memory burden is made no worse when combining blocks, since the covariance matrices we need to form are governed by the square of the sizes of the U's. In practice, this rule also reduces the computational burden since, when working with small covariance matrices,

the computational demand is often dominated by filling in the entries of the covariance matrix rather than factoring the matrix. Only neighbors are considered as candidates for joining, ensuring that at most nm comparisons are made, and that we make comparisons between blocks that contain points that are near each other, which is advisable because distant points are unlikely to share many neighbors unless they appear early in the ordering.

4 Further computational considerations

This section describes computational considerations for the problems of finding orderings and nearest neighbors, approximately drawing from unconditional and conditional Gaussian process distributions, and profiling out linear mean parameters. Code for all methods is provided in online supplementary material.

4.1 Finding Orderings and Nearest Neighbors

Considering arbitrary permutations of the observations presents two computational issues that are not encountered in coordinate-based orderings. The first is finding the orderings. For example, finding the MMD ordering is $O(n^3)$ in computing time. If we plan to condition on the m nearest neighbors, the second problem is how to find the ordered nearest neighbors, that is, the set of m nearest neighbors to location $x_{\tau(i)}$ among $x_{\tau(1)}, \ldots, x_{\tau(i-1)}$. A naive algorithm for finding neighbors would require $O(n \log n)$ operations to compute and sort distances to any point, and thus a total of $O(n^2 \log n)$ operations.

It is possible to construct approximations to the MMD ordering that run in $O(n^2)$ or $O(n \log n)$ time. I first describe a quadratic time algorithm. To select the kth point in the ordering, randomly choose M points from the set of unselected points, and then select the kth point to be the one among the M randomly selected points that has maximum minimum distance to the already selected ponts. This runs in $O(Mn^2)$ time. An $O(n \log n)$ algorithm proceeds as follows. First divide the domain up into grid boxes, with the number of grid boxes proportional to the number of observations. Assigning each point to its grid box can be done in linear time with a simple rounding method. Using the center of each grid box as its location, then use MMD to order the grid boxes. Once the grid boxes are ordered, loop over the grid boxes according to the grid box ordering, each time picking the point from the current grid box with largest minimum distance to any selected points in the current or neighboring grid boxes, stopping when all points have been ordered. If the number of grid boxes g is small, one can use the naive $O(g^3)$ algorithm or the $O(g^2)$ approximation to order them. However, for very large problems, ordering the grid boxes may constitute a substantial burden, and this algorithm can be used recursively to order the grid boxes, thus giving an $O(n \log n)$ algorithm.

Searching for nearest neighbors in metric spaces is a well-studied problem. Vaidya (1989) describes an $O(n \log n)$ algorithm for finding the nearest neighbor to all n points. The algorithm uses a tree-based partitioning of the points to quickly narrow down the set of points that are candidates for being nearest each point. I implement a simplified version of this algorithm that groups each point into a grid box and searches for nearest neighbors in neighboring grid boxes. The algorithm can be sped up if one knows a priori which grid boxes contain the m nearest points; otherwise it is necessary to sequentally add nearby grid boxes to the search path until m nearest neighbors have been found, and so that points in all other grid boxes cannot be closer. For uniformly distributed points, one can make an informed starting guess of how many neighboring grid boxes must be searched by dividing the total number of candidate points by the number of grid boxes and multiplying by m. This is important for ordered nearest neighbors because the candidate points are fewer earlier in the ordering, and thus more grid boxes must be searched for earlier points.

4.2 Unconditional and Conditional Draws

Whereas Kriging interpolation requires only matrix multiplication and linear solves with the covariance matrix, which can usually be done in $O(n^2)$ operations with a good iterative solver, unconditional and conditional draws (simulations) from the Gaussian process model generally require us to factor the covariance matrix, which is $O(n^3)$ operations. One advantage that Vecchia's approximation has is that it defines an approximation to the inverse Cholesky factor, which can be used to perform approximate draws from the Gaussian process model. This approximation can also be used to perform conditional draws of unobserved values given the observations, which, when done many times in an ensemble, is a useful way of quantifying the joint uncertainty associated with interpolated maps.

To simplify the following equations, write Γ as the inverse Cholesky factor of the $n \times n$ covariance matrix Σ, and $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ as the approximation to Γ implied by Vecchia's likelihood. Let Z be an uncorrelated vector of standard normals of length n. Then $Y = \widetilde{\Gamma}^{-1}Z$ is approximately $N(0, \Sigma)$. We use Kullback-Leibler divergence in Section 5 to monitor the quality of the approximations. Since $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is sparse and triangular, solving for Y, and thus drawing approximately from from $N(0, \Sigma)$, can be done in $O(n)$ operations. Suppose Y is parititioned into two subvectors as $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)$ and write Σ as a 2×2 block matrix $\{\Sigma_{ij}\}_{i=1,2}$. To predict Y_2 from Y_1, We compute $E(Y_2|Y_1) = \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}Y_1$. This can be rewritten in terms of the inverse Cholesky factor as $E(Y_2|Y_1) = -\Gamma_{22}^{-1}\Gamma_{21}Y_1$. Thus we can compute approximate conditional expectations as $-\widetilde{\Gamma}_{22}^{-1}\widetilde{\Gamma}_{21}Y_1$. Solving a linear system with $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{22}$ can also be achieved in linear time because $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{22}$ is sparse and lower triangular.

Conditional draws can be done at the cost of one unconditional draw and one conditional expectation. Suppose that the data are in the vector Y_1, and that $Y^* = (Y_1^*, Y_2^*)$ is an unconditional draw from $N(0, \Sigma)$. Then, conditionally on Y_1, $-\widetilde{\Gamma}_{22}^{-1}\widetilde{\Gamma}_{21}(Y_1 - Y_1^*) + Y_2^*$ approximately has mean $\Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}Y_1$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma_{22} - \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{11}^{-1}\Sigma_{12}$ and thus is an approximate conditional draw of Y_2 given Y_1. We use ensembles of conditional draws in Section 6 to quantify uncertainty in interpolations of satellite data.

4.3 Profile Likelihood with Linear Mean Parameters

The Gaussian process model often includes a mean function that is linear with respect to a set of spatial covariates. Stein et al. (2004) outlined methods for computing residual (also known as restricted) likelihoods to avoid having to numerically maximize the approximate likelihood over the mean parameters. If one prefers to obtain the maximum approximate likelihood estimates of all parameters, it is usually computationally advantageous to profile out the mean parameters. Writing $E(Y) = X\beta$, where X is the $n \times p$ design matrix, and β is the vector of linear mean parameters, Vecchia's approximate likelihood becomes

$$\log p_{\theta,\beta,\tau,J}(y) = -\frac{n}{2}\log(2\pi) + \log\det \widetilde{L}^{-1} - \frac{1}{2}\|\widetilde{L}^{-1}(y - X\beta)\|^2.$$

For fixed θ, the maximum approximate likelihood estimate for β is

$$\widehat{\beta}(\theta) = (X^T\widetilde{L}^{-T}\widetilde{L}^{-1}X)^{-1}X^T\widetilde{L}^{-T}\widetilde{L}^{-1}y = \left[(\widetilde{L}^{-1}X)^T(\widetilde{L}^{-1}X)\right]^{-1}(\widetilde{L}^{-1}X)^T(\widetilde{L}^{-1}y).$$

Multiplying $\widetilde{L}^{-1}X$ can be done column-by-column, each of which takes the same computational effort as multiplying $\widetilde{L}^{-1}y$, which is the most computationally demanding task in the approximate likelihood evaluation. Thus profiling out the linear mean parameters can be done at the roughly the cost of p additional approximate likelihood evaluations per iteration when maximizing over θ.

5 Numerical and timing experiments

This section contains numerical results studying differences in the relative quality Vecchia's approximation with respect to choices for the permutation and grouping. Vecchia's approximation is also compared to a simple block independent Gaussian process approximation, since this approximation is easily constructed and has been shown to be competitive with state-of-the-art approximations (Stein, 2014). Comparisons are also made with stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) approximations (Lindgren et al., 2011) and tapered covariance approximations. For all comparisons, the Matérn covariance function is used,

$$M(r;\sigma^2,\alpha,\nu) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\Gamma(\nu)2^{\nu-1}}\left(\frac{r}{\alpha}\right)^{\nu}\mathcal{K}_{\nu}\left(\frac{r}{\alpha}\right),$$

which has emerged as the model of choice for practitioners of spatial statistics (Guttorp and Gneiting, 2006). The covariance function has three positive parameters σ^2, α, and ν, which are the variance, range, and smoothness parameters, respectively. The mean of the process is assumed to be known to be zero. In the numerical studies, six different parameter choices are presented, with $\sigma^2 = 1$ in all six, while the range and smoothness cover all combinations of $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.2\}$ and $\nu \in \{1/2, 1, 3/2\}$. The locations form an 80×80 regular grid on the unit square, giving 6400 locations. Example realizations from the six models are given in Figure 11 in Appendix A. Four orderings are considered: sorted coordinate, middle out, completely random, and AMMD. Ungrouped and grouped versions, and 30 and 60 nearest neighbors are considered. As mentioned in Section 3, calculations in the grouped versions effectively condition on more neighbors, so when discussing the results, "grouped version with 30 neighbors" refers to a grouped version of a likelihood approximation that initially conditioned on 30 neighbors.

The combinations above consist of (6 parameter settings) $\times$ (4 orderings) $\times$ (30 vs. 60 neighbors) $\times$ (ungrouped vs. grouped) = 96 settings, not counting the block approximations or the SPDE approximations. Exploring such a large number of scenarios with simulations would not be feasible since expensive replication is required to control Monte Carlo error size. Instead, I use two deterministic criteria to evaluate the different approximations: (1) KL-divergence from the implied approximate model to the target model, (2) asymptotic relative efficiency for estimating covariance parameters, computed using the robust information criterion (Heyde, 2008). The section concludes with a timing study showing how the various computational tasks for Vecchia's approximation scale with the number of observations. All timing comparisons are done on a 2014 Macbook Air with a 1.7GHz Intel Core i7 processor (dual core) with 8GB RAM. Code is written in the R programming language (R Development Core Team, 2008), running Microsoft R Open 3.2.4, which uses multithreaded BLAS/LAPACK libraries.

5.1 Kullback-Leibler Divergence

For the $\nu = 1$ cases, an SPDE approximation (Lindgren et al., 2011) is also considered. The SPDE approximation provides computational savings by using a sparse inverse covariance matrix and is valid for integer values of the smoothness parameter in two spatial dimensions. To address edge effects in the SPDE approximation, I use the boundary extension described in Lindgren et al. (2011). Several choices of boundary parameters were considered, with only small differences among choices. For the $\nu = 1/2$ case, I also consider a tapered covariance approximation (Furrer et al., 2006; Kaufman et al., 2008) with three tapering ranges as a competitor. In contrast to Vecchia's approximation, the KL divergence from the SPDE or tapered approximations to the target model is not minimized at the target model's parameter values, so I perform an optimization to find the range and variance parameters to minimize the KL-divergence. SPDE Computations were implemented using functions from the R-INLA package (Rue et al., 2009), tapering from the fields package (Nychka et al., 2016).



Figure 3: KL-divergences for Matérn covariances with variance = 2, range $\in \{0.1, 0.2\}$, and smoothness $\in \{1/2, 1, 3/2\}$. Locations form 80×80 grid on the unit square. Number of neighbors (30 and 60) indicated next to ungrouped symbols. Gray lines connect the grouped version to the ungrouped version of each approximation.

The KL divergence results are plotted in Figure 3, and the discussion of the reuslts is organized according to the smoothness parameter setting. When $\nu = 1/2$, which corresponds to an exponential covariance function, AMMD ordering reduces KL divergence relative to sorted coordinate ording by more than a factor of 20 for both range parameter settings when the number of neighbors is 30. Both orderings run in roughly the same amount of time. When the observations are grouped, the approximations improve and run in faster time. When using the AMMD ordering, the computation times are cut in half, and the improvement in KL divergence over the sorted coordinate ordering with no grouping increases to a factor of 78 when $\alpha = 0.1$ and a factor of 84 when $\alpha = 0.2$. For 60 neighbors the effect of ordering is more striking; AMMD ordering and grouping results in a computational speedup of a factor of 1.9 and an accuracy increase of a factor of 389 for $\alpha = 0.1$, and a speedup of 2.1 and accuracy increase of a factor of 276 for $\alpha = 0.2$. Covariance tapering is not competitive for any of the tapering ranges. The grouped approximation with AMMD ordering and 30 neighbors is more than 14,000 times more accurate than the tapered approximation that runs in roughly the same amount of time.

Using $\nu = 1$ allows for a comparison with SPDE approximations. The major story is that the grouped approximations with AMMD ordering run as fast as the SPDE approximation but are far more accurate; for $\alpha = 0.1$, KL-divergence is reduced by a factor of 184, and for $\alpha = 0.2$ by a factor of 167. Computing times for the SPDE approximation include creating the mesh, forming the precision matrix (with boundary extension), and computing the sparse Cholesky



Figure 4: Relative efficiencies for estimating three Matérn covariance parameters, variance = 2, range $\in \{0.1, 0.2\}$, and smoothness $\in \{1/2, 1, 3/2\}$. Locations form 80×80 grid on the unit square, and the four orderings considered are sorted coordinate, middle out, completely random, and AMMD. Results for ungrouped (black) and not grouped (magenta) are presented.

factor. Reordering of the precision matrix is done by internal functions in the R Matrix package (Bates and Maechler, 2016). As before, the AMMD orderings are most accurate, especially with 60 neighbors.

When $\nu = 3/2$, which is the smoothest model considered, the AMMD ordering is again most accurate for 60 neighbors. For 30 ungrouped neighbors, the differences among orderings is less substantial. In all cases, grouped orderings are more accurate and faster to compute than their ungrouped counterparts; actually the grouped calculation for 60 neighbors with sorted coordinate and middle out orderings are faster than their ungrouped 30 neighbor counterparts. In all parameter settings, the block independent approximations are never competitive in accuracy. The 3×3 block approximation generally runs roughly as fast as the fastest grouped approximation but is orders of magnitude less accurate. Finer blocking in the block independent approximation will run faster but will decrease in accuracy.

5.2 Relative Efficiency

The results of the numerical study on relative efficiency are summarized in Figure 4. In every parameter setting, for all three parameters, and for both neighbor sizes, the AMMD ordering with grouping outperforms the default sorted coordinate ordering without grouping. In some cases, the difference is quite large. For example, when estimating the range parameter for the Matérn with smoothness 1 and range 0.2, using the default sorted coordinate without grouping has 93.2% relative efficiency, whereas AMMD with grouping has 99.7% relative efficiency. This gain in efficiency comes at no additional computational cost.

In most cases, using 30 neighbors with the AMMD ordering and grouping is superior to using 60 neighbors with the default sorted coordinate ordering without grouping. Since the computational complexity scales with the cube of the number of neighbors, this means our proposed improvements to Vecchia's likelihood can achieve increases in relative efficiency while simulataneously reducing the computational cost by a factor of 8. Finally, perhaps the most surprising result of this numerical study is that the default orderings are almost always outperformed by a completely random ordering of the points. This is also true in the KL



Figure 5: Timing Results for increasing number of observations regularly spaced on a square grid.

divergence study. In both cases, the AMMD ordering offers further improvement.

5.3 Timing

In the context of analyzing data, it is useful to note which calculations must be carried out just once versus multiple times, and which calculations can be parallelized, although no explicit parallelization has been used in these studies. The ordering, grouping, and nearest neighbor calculations are computed just once. The likelihood calculations generally need to be repeated many times in the process of either numerically maximizing it with respect to covariance parameters, or sampling from posterior distributions in MCMC algorithms, but likelihood evaluations are embarassingly parallel due to the separability of Vecchia's specification. The nearest neighbor searches can be done in parallel. It is not clear if computing the AMMD ordering or any of the approximations could be done in parallel. The grouping algorithm is greedy, so likely will not benefit greatly from parallel computing either.

Figure 5 presents the results of the timing study for an increasing number of observations with the exponential covariance function and AMMD ordering. The study is carried out for 30 and 60 neighbors and up to 10^5 observations. For 30 neighbors, the slowest operation is finding the neighbors, followed by grouping, then the ungrouped likeliood, then ordering, and the grouped likelihood. The grouped likelihood for 10^5 observations was computed in 9.1 seconds. For 60 neighbors, the grouping algorithm was slowest for the largest sample sizes, followed by the ungrouped likelihood and finding the neighbors. The grouped likelihood with 60 neighbors required 21.9 seconds for 10^5 observations.

6 Jason-3 Satellite Wind Speed Observations

Launched in January 2016, the Jason-3 satellite is the latest in a series of satellites equipped with radar altimeters for measuring ocean surface height, wave height, and ocean wind speed (NASA-JPL, 2016). Jason-3 orbits the earth every 112 minutes along a path that repeats every 9.9 days. The data we consider are ocean surface wind speed values reported roughly once per second between August 4 and August 9, 2016 and are available at `http://www.nodc.noaa.gov/sog/jason/`. The goal of this analysis is to create interpolated maps of wind speed and quantify the joint uncertainty in the interpolations.

Data Preprocessing: The Jason-3 data files include rain and ice flags to signify the presence



Figure 6: Jason-3 wind speed values and observation times.

of liquid water and ice along the radar signal's path. These disruptions degrade the quality of the signal, and the Jason-3 products handbook (CNES et al., 2016) states that flagged measurements should be ignored. As a conservative measure, we discard any measurement taken within 30 seconds of passing over rain or ice. In order to ensure that we can perform extensive comparisons among statistical analyses for data spanning a reasonably long time period, we average the one second measurements within 10 second intervals, discarding any intervals that have missing values. The resulting data vector has 18,973 values. A map of the data is plotted in Figure 6.

Since the satellite can measure wind speeds at only a single location at any given time, it is expected that uncertainties in interpolated maps at specific times and locations will depend on whether there are nearby observations in space and time. This feature can be captured by modeling the data with a space-time Gaussian process. Specifically, for wind speeds at location $x \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, I consider a geostatistical model of the form

$$Y(x,t) = \mu + Z(x,t) + \varepsilon(x,t),$$

where μ is considered nonrandom, $\varepsilon(x,t)$ is uncorrelated $N(0,\tau^2)$ (nugget term), and $Z(x,t)$ is a space-time Gaussian process with a Matérn covariance function

$$\mathrm{Cov}(Z(x_1,t_1), Z(x_2,t_x)) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{\nu-1}\Gamma(\nu)}(d_{12})^{\nu}\mathcal{K}_{\nu}(d_{12}),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{\nu}$ is a modified Bessel function of the second kind, and

$$d_{12} = \sqrt{\frac{\|x_1 - x_2\|^2}{\alpha_1^2} + \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^2}{\alpha_2^2}},$$

so that the covariance function is isotropic in space, stationary in time, but with different range parameters for the space and time dimensions. The Matérn covariance is not generally valid with great circle distance metric on the sphere, so Euclidean distance is used. Guinness and Fuentes (2016) argued that there is no reason to expect the use of Euclidean distance on the sphere to cause any distortions. The model has five unknown covariance parameters, $(\sigma^2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \nu, \tau^2)$.

I consider three orderings for the observations in Vecchia's likelihood. The first is ordered in time, which I consider to be a default choice for this application. The second is completely



Figure 7: For ordering 3, first 1000 locations (black) and all locations (gray).

random, and the third is a variant of the MMD ordering tailored to the structure of the space-time data, described as follows. I first construct a sequence $\{a_{ij}\}$ with $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$, and $j = 1, \ldots, 2^{i-1}$, where $a_{ij} = (2j-1)/2^i$, giving

$$\frac{1}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}, \quad \frac{1}{8}, \frac{3}{8}, \frac{5}{8}, \frac{7}{8}, \quad \frac{1}{16}, \frac{3}{16}, \ldots$$

multiply each member in the sequence by n, then round to the nearest integer, obtaining a sequence of integers $j_1, j_2, \ldots$. Then I use $j_1, j_2, \ldots$ as the permutation of the time ordering to obtain the third ordering. This ordering mimics the MMD ordering in time and is extremely fast to compute, and also provides good spatial coverage in the early part of the ordering because of the orbital pattern of the satellite. Figure 7 shows the locations of the first 1000 ordered points amidst the set of all points.

The covariance parameters are estimated by maximizing the approximate likelihoods. Since the quality of Vecchia's approximation increases as neighbors are added, and maximum likelihood estimates are obtained in an iterative numerical search procedure, it is natural to consider a sequence of maximum approximate likelihood estimates, where each step in the sequence uses a larger number of neighbors than in the previous step. The estimates from an iterative procedure such as this can be monitored for convergence and stopped when successive parameter estimates do not change beyond some tolerance level. For each ordering, I start with 10 neighbors, find the maximum approximate likelihood estimate, and then I consider 20 neighbors, starting the optimization at the 10-neighbor parameter estimate, and so on up to 100 neighbors. As long as the optimization procedures are finding the legitimate maximum of the approximate likelihoods, the sequence of estimates from all orderings will all converge to the same maximum likelihood estimate, since all of the likelihood approximations converge to the exact likelihood when we condition on all possible past observations. Orderings can be compared to each other based on how many neighbors are required for convergence.

The results for the three orderings are plotted in Figure 8. Only the variance, spatial range, temporal range, and smoothness parameters are plotted because the nugget variance is esentially zero for every ordering and number of neighbors. It is clear that the parameter estimates from the random ordering and the MMD variant are converging more rapidly than are the estimates from the time ordering. For the random and MMD orderings, the estimates for all parameters are within 2% of the 100 neighbor estimates with just 50 neighbors, whereas the time ordered estimates do not appear to have settled down, even with 100 neighbors. The exception is smoothness parameter, whose estimates for 10 neighbors are within 2% of the 100 neighbor estimates for all orderings.

Spatial interpolations are computed on an evenly spaced grid of size 120×240 in latitude



Figure 8: Estimated parameters for increasing number of neighbors. Vertical axis heights are 20% of the value of the last estimate from ordering 3.

and longitude at two time periods. The first is at the average of all the observation times, to represent a hindcast, a prediction of past values from past data. The second is at the time of the last observation, to represent real-time interpolation of the data. Using ordering 3 for the observations, a random ordering for the prediction points, and 60 nearest neighbors with grouping, I compute 4000 conditional draws and use the sample variances of the conditional draws to estimate the conditional variances at each of the prediction points. The predictions and their standard deviations are plotted in Figure 9. As expected, the standard deviations are generally smaller for the hindcast predictions, and one can clearly see the effect of the orbital path of the satellite; locations along recently visited paths have smaller standard deviations. Further, the standard deviations are small at high and low latitudes, reflecting the fact that the satellite passes near the poles on every orbit. Finally, Figure 10 contains two individual hindcast conditional draws and maps of conditional correlations with two points in the soutern Atlantic Ocean. One can see that the conditional correlation structure is quite complex and inhomogenous among the two points. A possible explanation is that this region has nearby observations in space and time, as can be seen from bottom left panel of Figure 9.

7 Discussion

This paper demonstrates that reordering and grouping operations can lead to substantial improvements in the quality of Vecchia's approximation, sometimes by more than two orders of magnitude compared to default ungrouped approximations. Grouping also reduces the computational effort over ungrouped versions, and the grouping algorithm introduced here is general in that it can be applied to any choice of ordering and neighbor sets. I have also provided the R code written for reordering, finding nearest neighbors, automatic grouping, and likelihood evaluations.

One perhaps surprising result of this study is that Vecchia's approximation with MMD ordering and grouping with 30 neighbors runs roughly as fast as an SPDE approximation, while being more than two orders of magnitude more accurate in terms of KL divergence. Certainly more numerical results are needed in more cases, but this result coupled with the fact that Vecchia's approximation is valid for general covariance functions rather than being restricted to Matérn with integer smoothness, suggests that Vecchia's approximation should be considered as a candidate for approximating Matérn models whenever the SPDE approximation is considered.



Figure 9: Predictions (top row) and simulated prediction standard deviations (bottom row) of windspeed at the mean observation time (left) and the last observation time (right).

I have provided a theory to explain why grouping is effective. However, a general theory for reordering remains elusive. One reason for this is the diversity of covariance functions and observation settings to be considered. Results on the screening effect (Stein, 2002) may be helpful for pushing the theory forward in some special cases. However, I caution against drawing strong conclusions based on one-dimensional results. For example, for the exponential covariance in one-dimension, Vecchia's approximation is exact when observations are sorted along the coordinate and just a single nearest neighbor is used. Unsorted orderings require two neighbors for at least one of the points. I suspect that intuition gleaned from these one-dimensional examples has been incorrectly applied to the two-dimensinoal case, leading to the preference for sorted coordinate orderings in two dimensions.

This paper considers the effect of ordering with the rule for choosing neighbor sets held constant. Stein et al. (2004) presented examples where including some distant neighbors can help in estimating parameters that control the behavior of the covariance function away from the origin. I have tried this approach but was not able to improve on nearest neighbors. A possible explanation is that I consider the Matérn model with a different parameterization than in Stein et al. (2004). I note here that the likelihood with MMD ordering automatically includes information about distant relationships since observations early in the ordering necessarily condition on distant observations since early observations are necessarily distant from one another. Nonetheless, exploring the interaction between ordering and neighbor selection would be interesting. The work of Gramacy and Apley (2015) explores fast automatic neighbor selection in a different context and could be relavent to this question.

Acknowledgements

The author is supported by the National Science Foundation Division of Mathematical Sciences under awards 1406016 and 1613219.

References

Amestoy, P. R., Davis, T. A., and Duff, I. S. (1996). An approximate minimum degree ordering algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 17(4):886–905.



Figure 10: For hindcast, two individual conditional draws (top row) and empirical conditional correlations at two points in the southern Atlantic.

Banerjee, S., Carlin, B. P., and Gelfand, A. E. (2014). *Hierarchical modeling and analysis for spatial data*. CRC Press.

Bates, D. and Maechler, M. (2016). *Matrix: Sparse and Dense Matrix Classes and Methods*. R package version 1.2-4.

CNES, EUMETSAT, JPL, and NOAA/NESDIS (2016). Jason-3 products handbook.

Datta, A., Banerjee, S., Finley, A. O., and Gelfand, A. E. (2015). Hierarchical nearest-neighbor Gaussian process models for large geostatistical datasets. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, (just-accepted):00–00.

Datta, A., Banerjee, S., Finley, A. O., and Gelfand, A. E. (2016). On nearest-neighbor Gaussian process models for massive spatial data. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, 8(5):162–171.

Eide, A. L., Omre, H., and Ursin, B. (2002). Prediction of reservoir variables based on seismic data and well observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(457):18–28.

Furrer, R., Genton, M. G., and Nychka, D. (2006). Covariance tapering for interpolation of large spatial datasets. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15(3):502–523.

Gramacy, R. B. and Apley, D. W. (2015). Local Gaussian process approximation for large computer experiments. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 24(2):561–578.

Guinness, J. and Fuentes, M. (2016). Isotropic covariance functions on spheres: Some properties and modeling considerations. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 143:143–152.

Guttorp, P. and Gneiting, T. (2006). Studies in the history of probability and statistics XLIX on the Matérn correlation family. *Biometrika*, 93(4):989–995.

Heyde, C. C. (2008). *Quasi-likelihood and its application: a general approach to optimal parameter estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Jones, R. H. and Zhang, Y. (1997). Models for continuous stationary space-time processes. In *Modelling longitudinal and spatially correlated data*, pages 289–298. Springer.

Kaufman, C. G., Schervish, M. J., and Nychka, D. W. (2008). Covariance tapering for likelihood-based estimation in large spatial data sets. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(484):1545–1555.

Lindgren, F., Rue, H., and Lindström, J. (2011). An explicit link between Gaussian fields and Gaussian Markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 73(4):423–498.

Mardia, K. V. and Marshall, R. (1984). Maximum likelihood estimation of models for residual covariance in spatial regression. *Biometrika*, 71(1):135–146.

NASA-JPL (2016). Jason-3 mission website. `http://sealevel.jpl.nasa.gov/missions/jason3/`. Accessed: 2016-09-03.

Nychka, D., Furrer, R., Paige, J., and Sain, S. (2016). *fields: Tools for Spatial Data*. R package version 8.3-6.

Pardo-Igúzquiza, E. and Dowd, P. A. (1997). AMLE3D: A computer program for the inference of spatial covariance parameters by approximate maximum likelihood estimation. *Computers & Geosciences*, 23(7):793–805.

Pourahmadi, M. (1999). Joint mean-covariance models with applications to longitudinal data: unconstrained parameterisation. *Biometrika*, 86(3):677–690.

R Development Core Team (2008). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.

Rue, H., Martino, S., and Chopin, N. (2009). Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 71(2):319–392.

Saad, Y. (2003). *Iterative methods for sparse linear systems*. SIAM.

Stein, M. L. (2002). The screening effect in kriging. *Annals of statistics*, pages 298–323.

Stein, M. L. (2014). Limitations on low rank approximations for covariance matrices of spatial data. *Spatial Statistics*, 8:1–19.

Stein, M. L., Chi, Z., and Welty, L. J. (2004). Approximating likelihoods for large spatial data sets. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 66(2):275–296.

Sun, Y. and Stein, M. L. (2014). Statistically and computationally efficient estimating equations for large spatial datasets. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, (just-accepted):00–00.

Vaidya, P. M. (1989). An O(n log n) algorithm for the all-nearest-neighbors problem. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 4(2):101–115.

Vecchia, A. V. (1988). Estimation and model identification for continuous spatial processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 297–312.

Yannakakis, M. (1981). Computing the minimum fill-in is NP-complete. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 2(1):77–79.



Figure 11: Gaussian process realizations at the six Matérn parameter settings.

A Realizations from Models Studied

Figure 11 contains example realizations from the models used in the KL-divergence and relative efficiency studies.